

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOEL CARTER, — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

JAMIE AYALA, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Joel Carter, #410324  
(Your Name)  
Macomb Corr. Facility  
34625 26 Mile Rd  
(Address)

New Haven, MI 48048  
(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- I. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents on Petitioner's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim, by issuing a decision that conflict with this Court's precedent regarding the denial of medical treatment?
- II. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents on Petitioner's claim under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, by entering a decision that conflict with this Court's precedent regarding the right to refuse unwanted medical treatment?
- III. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents, by entering a decision that conflict with this Court's precedent regarding how only a trier of fact can resolve genuine disputes of material facts?
- IV. Did the lower court violate the law-of-the-case doctrine when it denied Davis' summary judgment motion on the merits, then granted Davis' summary judgment motion, on the second round without additional evidence?

## LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

JAMIE AYALA

ROBERT DAVIS

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

*U.S. Constitution, 8th Amend.*

*U.S. Constitution, 14th Amend.*

*42 U.S.C §1983*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	iii
JURISDICTION.....	iv
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	v
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	1
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	10

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *District Court Opinion (dated May 5, 2015)*

APPENDIX B *Report and Recommendation (dated March 30, 2015)*

APPENDIX C *District Court Opinion (dated March 30, 2017)*

APPENDIX D *Report and Recommendation (dated March 8, 2017)*

APPENDIX E *Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals Order (dated January 3, 2018)*

APPENDIX F *Affidavit of Joel Carter*

APPENDIX G *Mental Health Record*

*G-1, Dr. Ayala's, Med-Manager Complex Record*

*G-2, Davis' Mental Health Notes*

*G-3, Dr. Henry B. Thomas' Psychiatric Evaluation Record*

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

*Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242 (1986). . . 7

*Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976). . . . . 5

*Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994). . . . . 5

*Washington v. Gluckberg*, 521 U.S. 702 (1997). . . . 6

### STATUTES AND RULES

### OTHER

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix E to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was January 3, 2018.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Joel Carter, a Michigan state prisoner, filed this civil rights action against a prison psychiatrist (Ayala) and a social worker (Davis), alleging that they violated his Eighth Amendment right to appropriate medical care, and retaliated against him for exercising his right to refuse medical treatment in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Petitioner, (hereinafter "Carter"), is diagnosed with suffering from Multiple Sclerosis. As a result of his medical condition, Petitioner was diagnosed with a Psychosis Disorder. [App. F, Aff. of Joel Carter, at 2].

In December 2009, Carter transferred into the Ionia Correctional Facility and was assigned to Davis. Davis notified Carter that because of his "Major Mental Disability" ("MMD") of psychosis he cannot be subject to punitive or administrative segregation. [Aff. of Carter, at 3]. In April 2010, Carter was placed in segregation. Davis approached Carter's cell door and stated, that with a MMD-Carter would be placed into the facility's Secure Status Outpatient Treatment Program ("SSOPT") because segregation presented a risk of harm. [See App. G-2, Davis'

beift, meneng state nospisim a, retia) leot, menitit  
bns (oloyA) tertiadeg noring a terings nited etiin liris zitt  
ittuji. E eit betolair yatt tatt pripello, (eiva) retion leiosz a  
terings betolater bns, eras leibem stallingo at tliin trembent  
nitolair ni transact leibem erato at tliin eit pincere not mid  
trembent. Attingent ett to eiva) eewa) and ett to  
pincere atti w beengsib si, ("retia) retionized), menitit  
, noltios leibem eit to tliem a et. erionelz elgithM most  
, 2.99A]. noltos ziedeg a atti w beengsib eew menitit  
. [2 to, retia) leot to AAA  
sineI ett otri beretent retia, p005 iedmed nI  
beffton ziva]. ziva) of beengsib eew bns ytilent menitit  
("DMM") "philidzid lotneM 10j0M" eit to eewec tatt retia  
eritontinib 10 eritnig at tliidz ed tonos ed ziedeg to  
eew retia, 0105 lingA nI. [2 to, retia) to AAA]. noltaperge  
bns 100b 110c 2.1010 beengsib ziva]. noltaperge ni beeng  
ett otri beengsib bns retia-DMM a atti tatt, betate bns  
("T4022") mognit transact tritogtul erato eewc ipliit  
, ziva], 2-2.99A ee2]. mid to tlii a betneng noltaperge eewc  
pecces

Mental Health Note]. "The SSOTP is a mental health program designed for the therapeutic management and care of prisoners who are placed in segregation who suffer from a major mental disability, which may preclude adequate adjustment in segregation and assist towards the goal of managing these prisoners in general population. [MDOC Policy Directive 04.06.182].

Plaintiff- Petitioner was admitted into the program, but refused treatment. [Aff. of Carter, at 5]. Carter feared the officers who worked around mentally ill prisoners in the SSOTP unit. Later, Carter was asked on two more occasions, but refused. [Aff. of Carter, at 5-6].

On July 27, 2010, Davis approached Carter's cell door and stated, "if your not going to consent to participate in SSOTP, then I'll be sure that you see the doctor." [Id. at 7]. That same day, Dr. Ayala approached Carter's cell door stating, "Davis referred me to re-evaluate you." [Aff. of Carter, at 8]. The evaluation lasted less than three minutes and was conducted at Carter's cell door. After the meeting, Dr. Ayala changed Carter's diagnosis to an Anxiety Disorder, with no explanation of why he was discontinuing Carter's treatment for psychosis. Dr. Ayala also discontinued Carter's medication for his psychotic symptoms. By changing Carter's

bezenter tnd, mengong ett om bottenba raw venititul - tititul  
omur zogitto ett bezest retio] . [2 to , retio] to .AA] . tnevitit  
, retio] . tnu .AA22 ett ni mengong lii ylletum bnowa bollow  
to .AA] . bezenter tnd, mengong ett om bottenba raw venititul  
[2-2 to , retio]

baa roob lles irotloj berbonggo rivaL, 0105, 55 plnt n0  
natt, 91022 ni stoguiving at thenes of pmaop ton way fi", batake  
1/100 emar tant. [5 to 10] " roob wtt way tant rivaL ed 111 I  
em berbonggo rivaL", pinitre roob lles irotloj berbonggo slayA. 10  
batake nortoulake ent. [8 to, 1st to 3AA]. way stanlare-ent of  
roob lles irotloj to batake raw baa rotunim entt natt 221  
no at ieronosis irotloj bengnads slayA. 10 pinitre entt 2AA  
pinitre raw ed ylw to nortoulake on Hlw, batake pinitre  
irotloj benthosrib ocls slayA. 10 .irotloj ylw not transact irotloj  
irotloj epigenetic ylw .zmotomx irotloj ylw entt nortoulake

diagnosis, Respondents subjected Carter to segregation and ineligible for SSOTP.

In a mental health progress note on September 15, 2010 Davis states:

He continues to [complain of] his diagnosis, as he expresses the desire to go to the SSOTP. It should be noted that he had been accepted into SSOTP a few months back, and he refused to go on several occasions.

[App. G-2, Mental Health Record]. In another progress note Davis notes:

Inmate disagrees with diagnosis, especially as his current diagnosis makes him ineligible for SSOTP. This CM pointed out to him that he had been admitted to the SSOTP recently and he refused to go several times.

[App. G-2, Mental Health Progress Record]. On September 23, 2010, Dr. Ayala approached Carter's cell and Carter asked him to change his mental health diagnosis back to the psychosis disorder. Dr. Ayala stated in a "Med Management Complex" record:

His main concern is his ineligibility for the SSOTP portion of the out program. Upon reviewing the CM progress notes this is, in part at least, to his previous non-compliance, rather than solely due to a recent change of diagnosis as he claims.... I re-directed him to discuss his wish to return to the SSOTP with his CM and if both come to the conclusion it is worthwhile and possible as a second chance. I'll be glad to reassess

Older birds were visitors of the Cenozoic era. - T9022 1st

0105, 21 minutes 20 sec away from return to NI

water evol.

zivell eter zwijger vertrouw in [Broek Heest Lutje M, 5-3-99A]

2-ston

thems eind zo kluisgegaan, eiconceptis htiw weespoesib otom. I  
betriuq MJ eind. GT022 tot eldigleni mid zetom eiconceptis  
yHnsoet GT022 eft of kettimbo need bad ed tent mid of two  
-emt lorense op of bernter en bns

10105, 55 redmetgel rd. [b10038 22010019 Atlast lotus M, S-3.90A]  
eggs at mid holes (red) bnd (less 2 red) berberomes slayA 10  
slayA 10. red 10216 circovirus out of red circovirus Atlast lotus 21

:b10233 "xolqma3 transponoM b9M" a ni betotz

For *neurog* 47022 *att* *rat* *philidelphiensis* *zid* *ei* *monos* *niem* *zitt*  
*zitt* *zoton* *cecepis* *MG* *att* *genus* *rever* *noq* . *Monopig* *two* *att*  
*ratte* , *conca*-*non* *zvivivq* *zid* *at* *travel* *to* *trig* *ni* , *ei*  
.... *zvivib* *et* *zo* *zivongib* *to* *zvivib* *treco* *s* *at* *sub* *pheloz* *zatt*  
47022 *att* *ratte* *at* *driv* *zid* *zvivib* *at* *mid* *betreib*-*er* *I*  
*glidwthrow* *ei* *ti* *niem* *co*  
*zvivib* *att* *at* *some* *attod* *in* *bno* *MG* *zid* *attiv*  
*zvivib* *at* *bno* *et* *II* . *conca* *bno* *s* *zo* *oldizeng* *bno*

and reconsider a more favorable diagnostic re-formation. In principle - regardless of internal directives, it is my clinical opinion that individuals with a degenerative neurological condition with poor prognosis such as MS, plus criminality and mental illness to boot, are generally in need of more intensive services regardless of the label assigned to them.

[App. G-1, Med-Management Complex Record]. Dr. Ayala noted in this Mental health record "the patient is exhibiting signs of psychosis". Id. However, Dr. Ayala failed to correct his unlawful actions.

On May 29, 2011, Carter attempted to commit suicide after being subjected to segregation for 11-months. Dr. Thomas Henry found that Carter's "clinical status was worsening," and that Carter "suffered from paranoia, delusions, and suicidal behavior, along with sleeping and eating problems." [App. G-3, Psychiatric Evaluation]. Dr. Henry re-diagnosed Plaintiff with a psychosis disorder. On June 16, 2011 Carter was transferred to an inpatient mental health facility and released from segregation.

Based on the above allegations, Carter asserts that Respondents intentionally switched or downgraded his diagnosis based solely on his refusal to enter SSOTP. Carter also asserts that Respondents could not use segregation as a lever ~~to~~ to force Carter to accept treatment when segregation itself put him at risk of harm.

. aitamot - en sivongpib elamot s10m a nabiengsai bns  
ym ei ti, sivongpib laimai to sivongpib - elamot n  
sivongpib a Hiiw elamotibni tatt noinig laimai  
ewp, 2M to sivongpib 100g Hiiw nabiengsai laimai  
ben ni ylaiwep era, tatt of sivongpib laimai bns ptahimis  
laungpib ledai ett to sivongpib sivongpib sivongpib era to  
. mett of

ett ni boston sivongpib. [boston xelqao thamponM-bM, 1-2.99A]

. bI . sivongpib to sivongpib sivongpib ett" boston attam lotam

. sivongpib lotam sivongpib lotam of boston sivongpib. [sivongpib  
sivongpib sivongpib lotam of boston sivongpib, 1105, 95 yM n

ymott sivongpib. [sivongpib-11 lot sivongpib of boston sivongpib sivongpib

attam lotam "sivongpib sivongpib lotam" sivongpib tatt boston  
sivongpib lotam bns, sivongpib sivongpib lotam bns sivongpib

sivongpib, 1-2.99A]. sivongpib sivongpib lotam sivongpib Hiiw poto

sivongpib a Hiiw attam lotam sivongpib-11 ymott. [sivongpib

sivongpib lotam of boston sivongpib 1105, 11 ymott n. sivongpib

. sivongpib lotam boston lotam sivongpib lotam lotam

attam sivongpib lotam, sivongpib lotam ett no boston

sivongpib sivongpib lotam boston ylaiwep sivongpib sivongpib

sivongpib lotam sivongpib. 97022 sivongpib lotam sivongpib lotam no ylaiwep boston

attam sivongpib sivongpib lotam boston sivongpib lotam sivongpib

tug flecti sivongpib sivongpib sivongpib sivongpib sivongpib sivongpib

. mid to air to mid

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents on Petitioner's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim, by issuing a decision that conflicts with this Court's precedent regarding the denial of medical treatment?

Petitioner argues that the lower court err because its decision conflicts with this Court's controlling authority in *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 97 S.Ct. 285 (1976); and *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 114 S.Ct. 1970 (1994). The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals concluded that Carter could not establish the objective or subjective components of an Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim. Petitioner asserts that he submitted sufficient to meet his burden on summary judgment.

Petitioner argues in support of his petition, that the record clearly shows that Respondents changed his mental health diagnosis for non-medical, i.e., because Petitioner's non-compliance with treatment. Petitioner asserts that Respondents could not use segregation as a lever to force him to accept treatment when Respondents were aware that segregation subjected Petitioner to a substantial risk of harm. [See App. G-2, Treatment Team Plan Review "Major stressors that could increase risk of relapse" "Segregation".]

Broader soft tort, softest is to trigger in early renostive period  
incorporated lotus is beyond ethnogenesis tort zones physi-  
cally. Therefore it is considered that the period, e.g., 1910-1940 is  
a soft tort zone for the blues ethnogenesis tort zones which  
are ethnogenesis now. Therefore blues of mid 1910s of level  
high lotus zone is renostive blues tort zones now  
existing "soft tort" with mid most therefore, 1910-1940 [soft]. And to  
"soft tort" "regional to high blues tort

II. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents on Petitioner's claim under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, by entering a decision that conflicts with this Court's precedent regarding the right to refuse unwanted medical treatment?

Petitioner argues that the lower court's decision in this case conflicts with this Court's controlling authority in *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702; 117 S.Ct. 2258(1997). The Sixth Circuit concluded that refusal of treatment in a therapy program is not equivalent to refusal of forced psychiatric medication, and Carter failed to present evidence that Respondents change his diagnosis in retaliation for his exercise of his right. The district found contrary, and held that "the alleged Eighth Amendment violation is intertwined with plaintiff's right to refuse medical treatment, a right arises from the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment." [See App. B, R&R].

Petitioner argues that certain type of treatment rendered is irrelevant, and that a refusal of treatment - is a refusal of treatment, and that he should not be subject to retaliation for the exercise of this right.



III. Did the lower court err in granting summary judgment in favor of Respondents, by entering a decision that conflicts with this Court's precedent regarding how only a trier of fact can resolve ~~■~~ genuine disputes of material facts?

Petitioner argues that the lower court's decision in this case conflicts with this Court's ~~in~~ *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 257 (1986), concerning the appropriate method for analysing whether disputed issues of fact exist at summary judgment stage. The Sixth Circuit held that no issues of fact exist, and that Respondents are entitled to summary judgment. Petitioner argues, as the non-moving party, that the facts and evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to him, and that he submitted sufficient evidence from which a jury could reasonably find in his favor.

Petitioner asserts that Respondents motive is at issue, and that issues of fact in this record still remain; (1) whether Dr. Ayala discontinued Carter's medication and the effect of such denial of medication; (2) whether Respondents decision to change Carter's diagnosis based on medical judgment or were motivated by a desire to punish him for initially refusing treatment; (3) whether Respondents were aware that Carter was exhibiting symptoms of psychosis

ni tengubui yfommur gribnareg ni me tnuu rwoi ett bid . III  
ettilnaa tatt noisib a gribnareg yd , etnubnogreg to rwoi  
to rwoi a yho wod gribnareg tnebbaeg qmne zitt atti  
? etoot laistom to etnubnogreg qmne aac tatt

ett ni noisib etnuu rwoi ett tatt rwoi venit  
petitit .

RRH , vnu , yddo l ythedi . v nozleba ~~ni~~ etnuu zitt atti ettilnaa  
gribnareg rot bontem stengorags ett gribnareg , (1881) 225 , 545 261

tengubui yfommur to tixs tatt to rwoi bontem rwoi  
bns , tixs tatt to rwoi on tatt bled tixiS tixiS ett . epote

venit . tengubui yfommur at bontem era etnubnogreg tatt

etnubnogreg bns etoot ett tatt , ydag gribnareg ett 20 , rwoi  
et tatt bns , mid at oldmokot team tigil ett ni benniS ed team  
yfommur bns yfommur a dñiS mott sambina tnebbaeg benniS  
. rovt eit ni bnt

bns , rwoi to ei vitem etnubnogreg tatt etnubnogreg venit .

10 rwoi (1) ; niomon litz bns ett ni tatt to rwoi tatt  
bns heve to tatt ett bns noisibem i etnubnogreg benniS etnubnogreg  
i etnubnogreg etnubnogreg etnubnogreg etnubnogreg (2) ; noisibem to  
etnubnogreg a yd bontem new 10 tengubui bns no bns etnubnogreg  
etnubnogreg etnubnogreg (3) ; tnebbaeg gribnareg yfommur rot mid dñiS et  
etnubnogreg to etnubnogreg gribnareg new etnubnogreg tatt etnubnogreg new

during the period they ~~removed~~<sup>removed</sup> his diagnosis and treatment; (4) whether Respondents knew their change in treatment would keep Carter in segregation; (5) whether Respondents knew that housing Carter in segregation posed a substantial risk of harm, and (6) whether Carter suffered serious injury.

(v) ; tħentxaett bno u xonpojib id-<sup>bevvera</sup> tħallix jaqtib qiegħi bl-hawn tħentxaett ni sejnsi jaqtib wenti etħebn qed id-  
qiegħi bl-hawn tħentxaett ni sejnsi jaqtib wenti etħebn qed id-  
qiegħi bl-hawn tħentxaett ni sejnsi jaqtib wenti etħebn qed id-  
(d) bno , minn fu tħix l-ixxiedha u beqqi nistaxxex ni sejnsi  
. kieni sejnsi beżżejjek nistaxxex ni sejnsi

**IV. Did the lower court violate the law-of-the-case doctrine when it denied Davis' summary judgment motion on the merits, then granted Davis' second summary judgment motion on the merits without additional evidence?**

The Sixth Circuit held that the district court only decided the issues of exhaustion of administrative remedies and qualified immunity on the first round of summary judgment, and was not prevented from later deciding the merits of Petitioner's claims. [App. E, Opinion, at 4].

Petitioner asserts that this is not true and that a mistake has been made. The lower court did decide the merits on the first round of summary judgment in a Report and Recommendation dated March 30, 2015. [App. B, R&R, at 11-12]. This R&R was subsequently adopted as the opinion of the district court. The district specifically stated that "based on this record, genuine issues of material fact exist with respect to defendant Davis' involvement in plaintiff's treatment, including the treatment plaintiff received and the treatment which plaintiff refused." [Id].



## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

*Joel Carter*

Date: *June 1, 2018*



## APPENDIX A

